

7 April 1691.

THE
MYSTERIES
OF ^{4479. ad. 21}
^{1-6.}
The Christian Faith
ASSERTED and VINDICATED:
IN A
SERMON

Preached at

S. Laurence-Jewry in London,

APRIL the 7th. 1691.

Chillingfield
By the Right Reverend Father in GOD,
EDWARD Lord Bishop of Worcester.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. H. for Henry Mortlock at the
Phoenix in S. Paul's Church-Yard, 1696.



A
S E R M O N

Preached at

S. Laurence-Jewry ,

A P R I L the 7th. 1691.

1 T I M. I. 15.

*This is a faithful saying and worthy of all
acceptation, That Christ Jesus came in-
to the World to save Sinners, of
whom I am chief.*

IF these Words were to be under-
stood without any Restriction or
Limitation *that Christ Jesus came
into the World to save sinners*, they
would overthrow the great Design of
the Gospel, and make its Excellent Pre-
cepts Useless and Ineffectual. For, to
what purpose should men be put upon
the severe Practice of Repentance, Mor-
tification

tification and a continued Course of a Holy Life, if the meer being *Sinners* did sufficiently qualifie them for Salvation? This indeed would be thought a Doctrine worthy of all Acceptation by the greatest *Sinners*; but it could not be a faithful saying, being not agreeable either to the Nature of God, or Revelation of his Will by *Christ Jesus*. But *S. Paul* speaks of such *Sinners* as himself had been; *i. e.* such as had been great Sinners, but had truly and sincerely repented. *Of whom I am chief*. What then? Must we look on him as the Standard and Measure of such *Sinners* whom *Christ Jesus* came to save? What will then become of all those who have been Sinners of a higher Rank than ever he was? It's true in the Verses before the Text, he sets out his Sins, as a humble Penitent is wont to do, with the worst Colours and deepest Aggravations, *Who was before a blasphemer and a persecutor, and injurious*; but yet he adds, *that he obtained Mercy because he did it ignorantly, in unbelief*. How then is *S. Paul* the Chief of *Sinners*? Are Sins of Ignorance and Mistake the greatest of Sins, for which *Christ* died? Is there no Expiation for any other by *Jesus Christ*? What will be-

Ver. 13.

become then of all such who sin against Knowledge and Conscience, and not *in Ignorance and Unbelief*? Can none of these hope for Mercy by *Christ Jesus*, although they do truly Repent? But *the Blood of Christ* is said elsewhere *to cleanse us from all Sin*; not, while we continue in them, but if we repent and forsake them. And *Jesus Christ* is said *to be a Propitiation for our Sins*; and not for ours only, but for the Sins of the whole World. And therefore this Expression of S. Paul notes his great Humility and deep Sense of his own Sins; but doth not exclude others from the hopes of Pardon whose Sins have other Aggravations than his had. For, if we leave out the last words as peculiar to his Case, yet the other contain in them a true Proposition and of the greatest Importance to Mankind; *This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the World to save sinners.*

1 Joh. 1. 7.

Ch. 2. v. 2

This, you may say, is a matter out of all doubt among all such who hope for Salvation by *Christ Jesus*; for all are agreed, that one way or other we are to be *saved by him*. But there is great Difficulty as to the Way of *saving sinners by Christ Jesus*; whether by the *Doctrine*

Doctrine and Example of the Man Christ Jesus, by the Power he attained through his Sufferings; Or, by the Eternal Son of God's assuming our Nature, and suffering in our stead in order to the Reconciling God to us and making a Propitiation for our Sins. These are two very different *Hypotheses* or *Notions of Christ's coming to save Sinners*; and the former seems more Easie to be understood and believed; and the other seems to have Insuperable Difficulties in point of Reason; and to run our Religion into *Mysteries*, which expose our Faith and make Christianity appear Contemptible to Men of Sense and Understanding. Is it not therefore much better to embrace such a Scheme of it, as will have the least Objection against it, that so Men of Reason may not be tempted to Infidelity, and Men of Superstition may not under the Colour of *Mysteries* bring in the most Absurd and Unreasonable Doctrines?

These are plausible Insinuations, and would be apt to prevail on considering Mens minds, if they were to form and make a Religion that might be most accommodated to the *Genius* and *Humour* of the Age they live in. And truly no Men (by their own Authority) can pretend

pretend to a Right to impose on others any *Mysteries of Faith*, or any such things which are above their Capacity to understand. But that is not our Case; for we all profess to believe and receive *Christianity* as a *Divine Revelation*; and God (we say) may require from us the belief of what we may not be able to comprehend, especially if it relates to Himself, or such things which are Consequent upon the Union of the Divine and Human Nature. Therefore our business is to consider, whether any such things be contained in that *Revelation* which we all own; and if they be, we are bound to believe them, although we are not able to comprehend them.

Now here are two Remarkable *Characters* in these Words, by which we may examin these different *Hypotheses* concerning the way of *Salvation by Jesus Christ*.

I. *It is a faithfull saying*, and therefore must be contained in that Revelation which God hath made concerning our Salvation by Christ.

II. *It is worthy of all Acceptation; i.e.* most usefull and beneficial to Mankind.

Now

Now by these two I shall proceed in the Examination of them.

- I. Which is most agreeable to the Revealed Will of God.
- II. Which doth offer fairest for the Benefit and Advantage of Mankind.

I. Which is most agreeable to the revealed Will of God. For that we are sure is the most *faithfull saying*; since Men of Wit and Reason may deceive us, but God cannot. When the Apostles first preached this Doctrine to the World, they were not bound to believe what they affirmed to be a *faithfull saying* till they gave sufficient Evidence of their Authority from God, by the wonderful Assistance of the Holy Ghost. But now this *faithfull saying* is contained in the Books of the *New Testament*, by which we are to judge of the Truth of all *Christian* Doctrines. And when two different Senses of Places of Scripture are offer'd, we are to consider, which is most Reasonable to be preferr'd. And herein we are allow'd to Exercise our Reason as much as we please; and the more
we

we do so, the sooner we shall come to Satisfaction in this matter.

Now according to Reason we may judge that Sense to be preferr'd,

(1.) Which is most plain and easie and agreeable to the most received Sense of Words ; not that which is forced and intricate, or which puts improper and *metaphorical* Senses upon Words which are commonly taken in other Senses ; especially when it is no Sacramental thing, which in its own Nature is Figurative.

(2.) That which suits most with the Scope and Design not only of the particular Places, but of the whole *New Testament* ; which is, to magnifie God and to depress Man ; to set forth, the Infinite Love and Condescension of God *in giving his Son to be a Propitiation for our Sins* ; to set up the Worship of one *true God* in Opposition to *Creatures* ; to Represent and Declare the mighty Advantages Mankind receive by the *Sufferings of Christ Jesus*.

(3.) That which hath been generally received in the *Christian Church* to be the Sense of those place. For, we are certain, this was always look'd on as a matter of great Concernment to all Christians ;

and they had as great Capacity of understanding the Sense of the Apostles : and the Primitive Church had greater Helps for knowing it than others at so much greater Distance. And therefore the Sense is not to be taken from modern *Inventions*, or *Criticisms*, or pretences to *Revelation*; but that which was at first deliver'd to the *Christian Church* and hath been since received and embraced by it in the several Ages; and hath been most strenuously asserted, when it hath met with Opposition, as founded on *Scripture* and the *general Consent* of the *Christian Church*.

(4.) That which best agrees with the *Characters* of those Persons from whom we receive the Christian Faith; and those are *Christ Jesus* and his *holy Apostles*. For, if their *Authority* be lost, our Religion is gone; and their Authority depends upon their *Sincerity* and *Faithfulness*, and Care to inform the World aright in matters of so great Importance.

(1.) I begin with the Character which the Apostles give of *Christ Jesus* himself; which is, that he was a Person of the greatest Humility and Condescension, that he did not assume to himself that
which

which he might justly have done. For let the Words of *S. Paul* be understood either as to the *Nature*, or *Dignity* of *Christ*, it is certain that they must imply thus much, that when *Christ Jesus* was here on Earth, he was not of a vain assuming humour, that he did not boast of himself, nor magnifie his own Greatness, but was contented to be look'd on as other Men; although he had at that time far greater and Diviner Excellency in him than the World would believe. Less than this, cannot be made of those Words of the Apostle, *Who being in the* Phil. 2. 6, 7. *form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no Reputation and took upon him the form of a Servant.*

Now this being the *Character* given of him, let us consider what he doth affirm concerning himself. For although he was far from drawing the People after him, by setting forth his own Perfections; yet upon just Occasions, when the *Jews* contested with him, he did Assert such things, which must savour of Vanity and Ostentation, or else must imply that he was the *Eternal Son of God*. For, all Mankind are agreed that the highest degree of Ambition lies in Affe-

Atting Divine Honour, or for a meer Man
 to be thought a *God*. How severely did
 God punish *Herod* for being pleased with
 the Peoples folly in crying out, *the*
 Voice of *God* and not of *Man*? And there-
 fore he could never have born with such
 positive Assertions and such repeated
 Defences of his being *the Son of God* in
 such a manner as implied his being so
 from Eternity. This in his Disputes with
 the *Jews* he Affirms several times, *that*
 he came down from Heaven, not in a Me-
 taphorical but in a proper Sense, as ap-
 pears by those words, *What and if ye shall*
see the Son of Man ascend up where he was
before? In another Conference he assert-
 ed, *that he was before Abraham*. Which
 the *Jews* so literally understood, that
 without a Metaphor they went about to
 stone him; little imagining that by *Abra-*
ham the calling of the *Gentiles* was to be
 understood. But above all, is that Ex-
 pression which he used to the *Jews* at ano-
 ther Conference, *I and my Father are*
one; which they understood in such a
 manner that immediately they took up
 stones to have stoned him. What means
 all this Rage of the *Jews* against him?
 What? for saying *that he had Unity of*
Consent with his Father? No certainly.
 But

But the Jews misunderstood him. Let us suppose it ; would not our *Saviour* have immediately explained himself to prevent so dangerous a Misconstruction ? But he asked them, what it was they stoned him for ? They answer him directly and plainly, *because that thou be-^{v. 32, 33}ing a man makest thy self God.* This was home to the purpose. And here was the time for him to have denied it, if it had not been so. But doth he deny it ? Doth he say, it would be *Blasphemy* in him to own it ? No ; but he goes about to defend it ; and proves it to be no *Blasphemy* for him to say that he was the Son of God ; ^{v. 36,} *i. e. so as to be God,* as the *Jews* understood it. Can we imagin that a *meer Man* knowing himself to be such, should Assume this to himself ; and yet *God* to bear witness to him not only by *Miracles* but by a *Voice from Heaven*, wherein he was called his *beloved Son in whom he was* ^{Matt. 3. 17.} *well pleased* ? Could God be pleased with a mortal, finite, despicable Creature, as the *Jews* thought him, that Assumed to himself to be *God*, and maintained and defended it among his own People, in a solemn Conference at a very Publick Place in one of the *Portico's* of the Temple ? And this he persisted in to the last. For,

when the High Priest adjured him by the living God to tell, whether he were the Christ the Son of God, (for he, no doubt, had heard of the Result of this Conference in Solomon's Porch) Jesus said unto him, Thou hast said. S. Mark, more expressly, Jesus said I am. And this was the Blasphemy, for which they put him to death; as appears by the Evangelists. So that this ought to be a Dispute only between Jews and Christians; since it was the very point, for which they condemned him to death. And in his last most divine Prayer just before his suffering, he owns the Glory which he had with the Father before the World had a being. And now, O Father, glorifie thou me with the glory which I had with thee, before the World was. Was this nothing but the Glory which God had designed to give him? This is so far from being peculiar to Christ, that it is common to all whom God designs to glorifie; and takes away the distinction between the Decree and the Execution of it.

(2.) As to the Apostles, the Reason we believe their Testimony is, that they were Men of great Sincerity and Plainness, and of great Zeal for the Honour and Glory of God. And according to this

this *Character*, let us examin what they say concerning *Christ Jesus*.

He that was most conversant with him, and beloved by him, and lived to see his *Divinity* contested by some, and denied by others, is most ample in setting it forth in his Admirable, Sublime, *Joh. 1. 1, 2, &c.* and Divine Introduction to his Gospel. Which all the Wit of Mankind can never make tolerable Sense of, if they deny *Christ's* being the *Eternal Son of God*; and it is he, that hath preserved those *Conferences* with the *Jews*, wherein he asserts his own *Divinity*.

S. Paul was a Stranger to him while he lived; but at the same time when he was so zealous to perswade the *Gentiles* to the *Worship* of *God* and not of *Creatures*, he calls him *God*, over all blessed *Rom. 9. 5.* for evermore. And when he saith, that the *Eternal Power and Godhead* are known *Rom. 1. 20.* by the *Creation of the World*, he attributes *Col. 1. 16.* the *Creation of all things* to *Christ*, applying to him those words of the *Psalmist*, *Heb. 1. 2,* *Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the* *10.* *Foundation of the Earth and the Heaven,* the *Work of thy hands*. Which cannot be understood of any *Metaphorical Creation*.

And after the strictest Examination

of Copies, those will be found the best, which have that Reading on which our Translation is grounded. *And without*

1 Tim. 3. *Controversie great is the Mystery of God-*
16. *liness, God was manifest in the Flesh. So*
that God's being manifest in the Flesh is
made a great Part of the Mystery of Chri-
stianity.

But here arises a Difficulty, which deserves to be consider'd; *i.e.* If there
 “ were nothing in the Christian Doct-
 “ rine, but the Way of *Saving sinners*
 “ by the Doctrine and Example of
 “ Christ, there would be little Objecti-
 “ on to be made to it; since the obtain-
 “ ing Eternal Life is certainly the best
 “ thing can be proposed to Mankind, and
 “ the Precepts of Christ are Divine and
 “ Spiritual, Plain and Easie to be Under-
 “ stood, and Agreeable to the Reason of
 “ Mankind; but many other things are
 “ imposed on Men as necessary to be be-
 “ lieved concerning *Christ Jesus*, as to his
 “ *Divinity, Incarnation, and the Hypo-*
 “ *statical Union* of both Natures, which
 “ perplex and confound our Understand-
 “ ings; and yet these things are not only
 “ deliver'd as *Mysteries of the Christian*
 “ *Faith*; but the Belief of them is re-
 “ quired as necessary to the Salvation
 “ of

“ of Sinners ; whereas, if they are Re-
 “ vealed they are no longer *Mysteries*; and
 “ if they are not Revealed, how come
 “ they to be made Articles of Faith ?
 “ The Scripture knows of no other *My-*
 “ *steries of Faith* but such as were hid-
 “ den before the Revelation of them,
 “ but since they are Revealed they are
 “ plain and open to all mens Capacities ;
 “ and therefore it is a great Injury to the
 “ Plainness and Simplicity of the Gospel
 “ to impose such incomprehensible *My-*
 “ *steries*, as Necessary Articles of Faith ;
 “ and it is Abusing the Credulity of Man-
 “ kind, to make such things necessary
 “ to be believed, which are impossible
 “ to be understood. But those who have
 “ ever loved to Deceive and Abuse the
 “ rest of the World, have been always
 “ fond of the Name of *Mysteries* ; and
 “ therefore all such things are to be sus-
 “ pected, which come under that Name.
 “ For, all such Points which will not
 “ bear Examination, must be wrapt up
 “ and Reverenced under the Name of
 “ *Mysteries*, that is, of things to be swal- *Discourse*
 “ low’d without being understood. *But of the*
 “ the Scripture never calls that a *My-* *Word My-*
 “ *stery* which is *Incomprehensible* in it *tery, &c.*
 “ *self*, though never so much revealed. *p. 5.*

This

This is the main force of the Objection, which I shall endeavour to remove by shewing,

- (1.) That God may justly require from us in general, the Belief of what we cannot comprehend.
- (2.) That which way soever the Way of Salvation by *Christ* be explained, there will be something of that Nature found in it; and that those who reject the Mysteries of Faith run into greater Difficulties than those who assert them.
- (3.) That no more is required as a Necessary Article of Faith than what is plainly and clearly Revealed.

(1.) That God may justly require from us in general, the Belief of what we cannot comprehend. It is to very little purpose to enquire whether the Word *Mystery* in *Scripture* be applied to such particular Doctrines, whose Substance is Revealed, but the manner of them is incomprehensible by us; for why may not we make use of such a Word whereby to express things truly revealed, but above our Comprehension?

on? We are certain the Word *Mystery* is used for things far less difficult and abstruse; and why may it not then be fitly applied to such matters, which are founded on Divine Revelation, but yet are too deep for us to go to the bottom of them? Are there not *Mysteries* in Arts, *Mysteries* in Nature, *Mysteries* in Providence? And what Absurdity is there to call those *Mysteries*, which in some Measure are known, but in much greater unknown to us? Although therefore in the Language of Scripture it be granted, that the word *Mystery* is most frequently applied, *to things before hidden, but now revealed*, yet there is no Incongruity in calling that a *Mystery*, which being revealed, hath yet something in it which our understandings cannot reach to. But it is meer Cavilling to insist on a Word, if the Thing it self be granted. The chief thing therefore to be done is, to shew that God may require from us the belief of such things which are incomprehensible by us. For, *God* may require any thing from us, which it is reasonable for us to do; if it be then reasonable for us to give Assent where the manner of what *God* hath revealed is not comprehended, then *God* may certainly require

require it from us. Hath not God revealed to us that *in six days he made Heaven and Earth and all that is therein* ? But is it not reasonable for us to believe this, unless we are able to comprehend the manner of *God's* production of things ? Here we have something revealed and that plainly enough, *viz.* that *God created all things*, and yet, here is a *Mystery* remaining as to the manner of doing it. Hath not God plainly revealed that there shall be a *Resurrection* of the dead ? and must we think it unreasonable to believe it, till we are able to comprehend all the changes of the Particles of Matter from the *Creation* to the General *Resurrection* ? But it is said that *there is no Contradiction in this, but there is in the Mystery of the Trinity and Incarnation*. It is strange Boldness in Men to talk thus of *Monstrous Contradictions* in things above their Reach. The *Atheists* may as well say, *Infinite Power* is a *Monstrous Contradiction* ; and *God's Immensity* and his other unsearchable Perfections are *Monstrous Paradoxes and Contradictions*. Will Men never learn to distinguish between *Numbers* and the Nature of *Things* ? For *three to be one* is a *Contradiction in Numbers* ; but whether

Observations on Dr. Wallis his four Letters, p. 4.

an

an Infinite Nature can communicate it self to three *different Subsistences* without such a *Division* as is among Created Beings, must not be determin'd by bare *Numbers*, but by the Absolute *Perfections* of the Divine Nature ; which must be owned to be above our Comprehension.

For let us examine some of those *Perfections* which are most clearly revealed and we shall find this true. The *Scripture* plainly reveals, that *God* is from *everlasting to everlasting* ; that *he was and is and is to come* ; but shall we not believe the Truth of this till we are able to fathom the *Abyss* of God's *Eternity* ? I am apt to think (and I have some thoughtful Men concurring with me) that there is no greater Difficulty in the Conception of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, than there is of *Eternity*. Not, but that there is great Reason to believe it ; but from hence it appears that our Reason may oblige us to believe some things which it is not possible for us to comprehend. We know that either God must have been for ever, or it is impossible he ever should be ; for if he should come into Being when he was not, he must have some Cause of his Being ; and that

which

Psal. 90. 2.
Revel. 1. 4.
c. 11. v. 17.

Bisterfield
c. Crell. p.
50.

Petav. de
Trinit. l. 3.
c. 9. sect.
15.

which was the first Cause would be God. But, if he was for ever he must be from himself ; and what Notion or Conception can we have in our Minds concerning it ? And yet, *Atheistical* men can take no Advantage from hence ; because their own most absurd *Hypothesis* hath the very same Difficulty in it. For something must have been for ever. And it is far more Reasonable to suppose it of an Infinite and Eternal Mind, which hath Wisdom and Power and Goodness to give Being to other things, than of dull, stupid and senseless Matter, which could never move it self, nor give Being to any thing besides. Here we have therefore a thing which must be owned by all ; and yet such a thing which can be conceived by none. Which shews the narrowness and shortness of our Understandings, and how unfit they are to be the Measures of the Possibilities of things. *Vain men would be wise* ; they would fain go to the very bottom of things, when alas ! they scarce understand the very Surface of them. They will allow no *Mysteries* in Religion ; and yet every thing is a *Mystery* to them. They cry out of *Cheats* and *Impostures* under the Notion of *Mysteries* ; and yet there is
not

not a Spire of Grass but is a *Mystery* to them; they will bear with nothing in *Religion* which they cannot comprehend, and yet there is scarce any thing in the World which they can comprehend. But above other things the *Divine Perfections*, even those which are most Absolute and Necessary are above their Reach. For let such Men try their Imaginations about God's *Eternity*, not meerly how he should be from himself, but how God should coexist with all the Differences of Times, and yet there be no Succession in his own Being. I do not say there is such Difficulty to conceive a Rock standing still when the Waves run by it; or the *Gnomon* of a Dial when the Shadow passes from one Figure to another; because these are gross unactive things; but the Difficulty is far greater where the Being is Perfect and always Active. For, where there is Succession there is a passing out of not being in such a duration into being in it; which is not consistent with the Absolute Perfection of the Divine Nature. And therefore God must be all at once what he is, without any Respect to the Difference of Time past, present or to come. From whence *Eternity* was defined by *Boethius* to be a
perfect

De Con-
sol. 1. 3.

perfect and complete Possession all at once of everlasting Life. But how can we form any Conception in our Minds of that being all at once, which hath such different Acts as must be measur'd by a long Succession of Time? As, the Creating and Dissolving the Frame of the World; the Promising and sending the *Messias*; the Declaring and Executing a general Judgment; how can these things be consistent with a Permanent Instant, or a Continuance of being without Succession? For, it is impossible for us in this Case, as to God's Eternity, to form a clear and distinct *Idea* in our Mind, of that which both *Reason* and *Revelation* convince us must be. The most we can make of our Conception of it is, that God hath neither Beginning of Being, nor End of Days; but that he always was and always must be. And this is rather a necessary Conclusion from Reason and Scripture, than any distinct Notion or Conception of Eternity in our Minds. From whence it evidently follows, that God may reveal something to us, which we are bound to believe, and yet after that Revelation the Manner of it may be incomprehensible by us, and consequently a *Mystery* to us.

Hath

Hath not God Revealed to us in *Scripture* the *Spirituality* of his own Nature? s. Joh. 4.
 That *he is a Spirit* and therefore will be ²⁴
worshipped in Spirit and in Truth; For,
 that is a true Reason why Spiritual Wor-
 ship should be most agreeable to him.
 Now, if we could have a clear, distinct
 positive Notion in our minds of God's
 Spiritual Nature, we might then pre-
 tend that there is nothing *mysterious* in
 this, since it is revealed.

But let such men Examine their own
 thoughts about this matter; and try,
 whether the utmost they can attain to,
 be not something *Negative*, viz. because
 great Absurdities would follow if we at-
 tributed any thing *Corporeal* to God;
 for, then he must be compounded of
 Parts, and so he may be dissolved; then
 he must be confined to a certain place,
 and not every-where present; he can-
 not have the Power of Acting and Self-
 determining which a meer Body hath
 not. For the clearest Notion we can
 have of *Body*, is, that it is made up of
 some things as parts of it, which may
 be separated from each other; and is
 confined to a certain place, and hath no
 Power to Move or Act from it self. But

some of these men who cry down *Mysteries* and magnifie Reason, to shew how slender their pretences to Reason are, have asserted a *Corporeal God*, with *Shape* and *Figure*. It was indeed, well thought of by those who would make a *Man* to be *God*, to bring *God* down as near to *Man* as might be. But how to Reconcile the Notion of a Body with Infinite Perfections, is a *Mystery* to me, and far above my Comprehension. But if it be no *Mystery* to such Men, they must either deny *God's* Infinite Perfections or shew how a bodily Shape can be capable of them. But some men can confound *Finite* and *Infinite*, *Body* and *Spirit*, *God* and *Man*, and yet are for no *Mysteries*; whereas these things are farther from our Reach and Comprehension, than any of those Doctrines which they find fault with. But to proceed.

If we believe *Prophecy*, we must believe *God's* fore-knowledge of future Events: For, how could they be fore-told if he did not fore-know them? And if he did fore-know those which he did fore-tell, then it was either because those only were revealed to him which is inconsistent with the Divine Perfections; or that

that he doth fore-know all other Events and only thought fitting to Reveal these: But how can they Solve the Difficulties about *Divine Prescience*? Is there no *Mystery* in this? Nothing above their Comprehension? What then made their great Master deny it, as a thing above his Comprehension? Because nothing can be fore-known but what hath a certain Cause, and therefore, if evil Actions be fore-told, God must be the Cause of them, and Men will not be free Agents in them. And yet it is most certain, that the Sufferings of Christ by the Wickedness of Men, were fore-told. What then? Must we make God the Author of Sin? God forbid. Will the righteous Judge of all the Earth, punish Mankind for his own Acts, which they could not avoid? Then we must yield, that there is something in the manner of the *Divine Prescience*, which is above our Comprehension. And the most Searching and Inquisitive Men have been forc'd to yield it at last, as to the Connection between the Certainty of Prescience and the Liberty of human Actions. Is it not then much better to sit down quietly at first, Adoring the Infi-

Cajetan in

1. q. 22.

art. 4.

niteneſs of God's incomprehenſible Perfections, than after all the huffings and diſputings of Men to ſay, *In Ignorantiâ ſolâ quietem invenio*, as the great School-man did? Surely then, here is ſomething plainly revealed, and yet the manner of it is ſtill a *Mystery* to us.

I ſhall not now inſiſt on any more of the particular Attributes of God, but only in general I deſire to know, whether they believe them to be *finite* or *infinite*? If to be *finite*, then they muſt have certain bounds and limits which they cannot exceed; and that muſt either be from the Imperfection of Nature, or from a Superiour Cauſe, both which are repugnant to the very Being of God. If they believe them to be *infinite*, how can they comprehend them? We are ſtrangely puzzled in plain, ordinary, finite things; but it is madneſs to pretend to comprehend what is *Infinite*; and yet if the Perfections of God be not *Infinite* they cannot belong to Him.

I ſhall only add, in Conſequence to this Aſſertion, *That if nothing is to be believed, but what may be comprehended, the very Being of God muſt be rejected*

too. And therefore I desire all such who talk so warmly against any *Mysteries in Religion* to consider whose Work it is they are doing; even theirs who under this pretence go about to overthrow all Religion. "For, say they, *Religion* is "a *Mystery* in its own Nature; not this "or that, or the other Religion; but "they are all alike, all is *Mystery*; "and that is but another Name for "Fraud and *Imposture*. What were the "Heathen *Mysteries* but tricks of *Priest-Craft*; and such are maintained and "kept up in all kinds of Religion. If "therefore these men, who talk against "*Mysteries* understand themselves, they "must in pursuance of their Principles "reject one God, as well as three Persons; "For, as long as they believe an Infinite and Incomprehensible Being, it is "Nonsense to reject any other Doctrine, "which relates to an *Infinite Being*, because it is *Incomprehensible*.

But yet these very Men, who seem to pursue the Consequence of this Principle to the utmost, must assert something more incomprehensible than the *Being of God*. For, I appeal to any man of common Understanding, whether it

be not more agreeable to Reason to suppose Works of Skill, Beauty and Order to be the Effects of a Wise and Intelligent Being, than of Blind Chance and Unaccountable Necessity ; whether it be not more agreeable to the Sense of Mankind to suppose an Infinite and Eternal Mind endued with all possible Perfections to be the Maker of this visible World ; than, that it should start out from it self, without Contrivance, without Order, without Cause ? Certainly such men have no Reason to find fault with the *Mysteries of Religion* because they are *incomprehensible*, since there is nothing so Absurd and Incomprehensible, as their darling *Hypothesis* ; And, there is nothing which can make it prevail, but to suppose Mankind to be as Dull and Insensible as the first *Chaos*.

Thus I have shewn that it is not unreasonable for *God* to require from us the Belief of something which we cannot comprehend.

(2.) I now come to consider, whether those who are so afraid of *incomprehensible Mysteries* in our *Faith*, have made

made it so much more easie in the Way they have taken. And notwithstanding all the Hectoring talk against *Mysteries* and things incomprehensible, in Religion, I find more insuperable Difficulties in point of Reason in their Way than in ours. As for instance,

(1.) It is a more Reasonable thing to suppose something *Mysterious* in the Eternal Son of God's *being with the Father before the World was made by him*; (as S. *John* expresses it in the beginning of his Gospel) than in supposing that although *John the Baptist* were born six Months before *Jesus Christ*; that yet *Christ* was in Dignity before him. What a wonderful *Mystery* is this? Can Men have the Face to cry down *Mysteries* in deep Speculations, and matters of a high and abstruse Nature, when they make such *Mysteries* of plain and easie things? And suppose the *Evangelist* in profound Language and lofty Expressions to prove a thing, which was never disputed, *viz.* although *Christ Jesus* were born six Months after *John*, yet he was in Dignity before him? Yet this was a *Mystery*, which, as I remember, *Faustus*

flus Socinus glories in that his Uncle *Lælius* obtained by Revelation.

(2.) It is a more Reasonable thing to suppose that a *Divine Person* should assume human Nature, and so the *Word to be made Flesh*; than to say, that an Attribute of God, his *Wisdom* or *Power* is *made Flesh*, which is a *Mystery* beyond all Comprehension; There may be some Difficulties in our Conception of the other, but this is a thing beyond all Conception or Imagination; For an *Accident* to be made a *Substance* is as absurd, as to imagin it to *subsist* without one.

(3.) It is more Reasonable to suppose that the Son of God should *come down from Heaven* and take our Nature upon him, than that a man should be rapt up into Heaven, that it might be said that he came down from thence. For in the former Supposition we have many other places of Scripture to support it, which speak of his *being with God*, and *having Glory with him before the World was*; whereas there is nothing for the other, but only that it is necessary to make some tolerable Sense of those words.

(4.) It

(4.) It is more Reasonable to believe that *God* should become *Man* by taking our Nature upon him, than that *Man* should become *God*. For in the former, there is nothing but the Difficulty of conceiving the Manner of the Union, which we all grant to be so between Soul and Body ; but in the other there is a Repugnancy in the very Conception of a *Created God*, of an *Eternal Son of Adam*, of *Omnipotent Infirmary*, of an *Infinite finite Being*. In the former Case, an *Infinite* is united to a *Finite* ; but in the other a *Finite* becomes *Infinite*.

(5.) It is more Reasonable to believe that *Christ Jesus* should suffer as he did for our sakes than for his own. We are all agreed that the *Sufferings* of *Christ* were far beyond any thing he deserved at *God's* hands ; but what Account then is to be given of them ? We say that he made himself a voluntary Sacrifice for Expiation of the Sins of Mankind ; and so there was a great and noble End designed, and no Injury done to a willing Mind ; and the *Scripture* as plainly expresses this, as it can do in Words. But others deny this, and make him to suffer as one wholly Innocent ; for what Cause ?

Cause? To make the most Innocent Persons as apprehensive of Suffering as the most Guilty ; and the most righteous God to put no difference between them, with Respect to Suffering.

(6.) It is more Reasonable to suppose such a Condescension in the Son of God to take upon him the Form of a Servant for our Advantage ; than that a *meer Man* should be Exalted to the *Honour and Worship* which belongs only to God. For, on the one side, there is nothing but what is agreeable to the Divine Nature, viz. *Infinite Love and Condescension and Pity* to Mankind ; on the other, there is the greatest Design of *Self-Exaltation* that ever was in *Human Nature*, viz. for a *meer Man* to have the most *Essential Attributes* and *Incommunicable Honour* which belongs to God. And whether of these two is more agreeable to the Spirit and Design of the New Testament, let any man of understanding judge. For as it is evident, that the great Intention of it is to magnifie the wonderful Love of God in the sending of his Son ; so it is as plain that one great End of the Christian Doctrine was to take Mankind off from

from giving Divine Worship to Creatures; and can we then suppose that at the same time it should set up the *Worship* of a *meer Man* with all the *Honour* and *Adoration* which belongs to *God*? This is to me an *incomprehensible Mystery* indeed, and far beyond all that is implied in the *Mysteries* of the *Trinity* and *Incar-nation*. For it Subverts the very Foundation of the Design of Christianity as to the Reforming *Idolatry* then in being; it lays the Foundation for introducing it into the World again; for since the Distance between God and his Creatures is taken away, in the matter of Worship, there is nothing left but the Declaration of his Will; which doth not exclude more *Mediators* of *Intercession* but upon this Ground, that the *Mediation* of *Redemption* is the Foundation of that of *Intercession*. And it is far more easie for us to suppose there may be some things too hard for us to understand in the Mystery of our *Redemption* by *Jesus Christ*, than that at the same time it should be both a *Duty* and a *Sin* to Worship any but the *true God* with proper Divine Worship. For if it be *Idolatry* to give it to a Creature, then it is a great Sin; for
so

so the Scripture still accounts it ; but if we are bound to give it to Christ who is but a Creature, then that which in it self is a Sin, is now become a Necessary Duty ; which overthrows the Natural Differences of Good and Evil, and makes *Idolatry* to be a meer *Arbitrary* thing. And I take it for granted, that in Matters of Religion, *Moral* Difficulties are more to be regarded than *Intellectual* ; because Religion was far more designed for a Rule of our Actions, than for the Satisfaction of our Curiosity. And upon due Examination we shall find that there is no such frightful Appearances of Difficulties in the *Mystery* of the *Incarnation*, as there is in giving *Divine Worship* to a *Creature*.

And it ought to be observed, that those very Places which are supposed to exclude Christ from being the *true God* ; must, if they have any force, exclude him from *Divine Worship*. For they are spoken of God, as the *Object* of our *Worship* ; but if he be not excluded from *Divine Worship*, then neither is he from being the *true God* ; which they grant he is *by Office*, but not *by Nature*.

But

S. Joh. 17.
3.

1 Cor. 6.6.

Socin. ad
Eutrop. p.
96. c. Wick.
c. 11. Ca-
tech. Ra-
cov. p. 65.

But a God by Office who is not so by Nature is a new and incomprehensible Mystery. A Mystery bidden from Ages and Generations as to the Church of God; but not made known by the Gospel of his Son.

This is such a kind of Mystery as the Heathen Priests had, who had Gods many and Lords many; as the Apostle saith, i. e. 1 Cor. 8. 5. many by Office although but one by Nature. But if the Christian Religion had owned one God by Nature and only one by Office, the Heathens had been to blame chiefly in the Number of their Gods by Office, and not in the divine Worship which they gave to them. But S. Paul blames the Heathens for doing Service to them which by Nature are no Gods; not for doing it without Divine Authority, nor for mistaking the Person who was God by Office, but in giving Divine Worship to them who by Nature were no Gods; which he would never have said, if by the Christian Doctrine, Divine Worship were to be given to one who was not God by Nature. Gal. 4. 8.

But these are indeed incomprehensible Mysteries how a Man by Nature can be a God really and truly by Office; how
the

the Incommunicable Perfections of the Divine Nature can be communicated to a Creature; how God should give his Glory to another, and by his own Command require that to be given to a Creature, which himself had absolutely forbidden to be given to any besides himself. It is said by a famous Jesuit (I will not say how agreeably to their own Doctrines and Practices about Divine Worship) that the Command of God cannot make him worthy of Divine Worship, who without such a Command is not worthy of it. And it is very absurd to say, that he that is unworthy of it without a Command, can become worthy by it; for it makes God to command Divine Honour to be given to one who cannot deserve it. (For no meer Man can deserve to be made God.) But it is more agreeable to the Divine Nature and Will not to give his Honour to a Creature.

Smiglec. de
Divin.
Verb. In-
earn. Nat.
P. 45.

Novus Mon-
stra, &c.
P. 42.

(3.) But after all the Invectives of these Enemies to Mysteries, we do not make that which we say is Incomprehensible to be a Necessary Article of Faith as it is Incomprehensible; but we do assert that what is Incomprehensible as to the Manner, may be a Necessary Article as far

far as it is plainly Revealed. As in the Instances I have already mentioned of the *Creation* and *Resurrection of the Dead*; would they in earnest have Men turn *Infidels* as to these things till they are able to comprehend all the difficulties which relate to them? If not, why should this suggestion be allow'd as to the *Mysteries* which relate to our *Redemption* by *Jesus Christ*? If it be said, *the Case is not alike for those are clearly Revealed and these are not*; this brings it to the true and proper Issue of this matter, and if we do not prove a *clear Revelation*, we do not assert their being *Necessary Articles of Faith*; but my present business was only to take off this Objection, That the *Mysteries* were Incomprehensible and therefore not to be received by us.

II. And so I come to the second Way, by which we are to Examine the several Senses of *Christ Jesus coming to save Sinners*: Which of them tends more to the Benefit and Advantage of Mankind; or which is *more worthy of all Acceptation*.

And that will appear by considering these things;

(1.) Which

(1.) Which tends most to the raising of our *Esteem* and *Love* of *Christ*

(2.) Which tends most to the begetting in us a greater *Hatred* of *Sin*

(3.) Which tends most to the strengthening of our *Hope* of *Salvation* by *Jesus Christ*.

(1.) As to the raising in us a greater *Esteem* and *Love* of *Christ*;

We are certain that the Infinite Love and Condescension of *Christ Jesus* in undertaking

such a Work as the saving of *Sinners* makes it most worthy of all Acceptation. Some

Men may please themselves in thinking that by taking away all *Mysteries* they

have made their *Faith* more easie, but I am certain they have extremely lessend the Argument for our *Love*, viz.

the Apprehensions of the wonderfull Love and Condescension of *Christ* in coming into the World to save *Sinners*.

And yet this is the great Argument of the New Testament to perswade Mankind to the *Love* of *God* and of his Son :

Joh. 3. 16. *God so loved the World that he gave his only begotten Son, &c.* This is indeed a mighty

mighty Argument of Love, if by *the only begotten Son* be meant the Eternal Son of God, *who came down from Heaven*, v. 13. as S. John speaks just before; but if no more be meant but only that God made a *meer Man* to be his Son, and after he had preached a while here on Earth and was ill used and crucified by his own People, he Exalted him to be *God* and gave him Divine Attributes and Honours; this were an Argument of great Love to the Person of Christ, but not to the rest of Mankind. But *God's Love* in *Scripture* is magnified with Respect to *the World* in the sending of his Son. *In this was manifested*, saith the Apostle, *the Love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the World that we should live through him.* *Herein is love*, not v. 10. *that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be a Propitiation for our Sins.* The great Love we still see is *towards us*, i. e. towards Mankind, but according to the other Sense it must have been. Herein was the Love of God manifested to his Son, that for his Sufferings he exalted him above all Creatures. *He that spared not his own Son*, saith S. Paul, *but deliver'd him up for us all.* If he were the *Eternal Son of God* who came to

D

suffer

John 1. 14.
ch. 3. v. 16.
Luk. 3. 22.

suffer for us, there is a mighty force and *Emphasis* in this Expression, and very apt to raise our Admiration and our Love; But what *not sparing his own Son* is there, if nothing were meant but that he designed by Sufferings to Exalt him? For *not sparing him* supposes an Antecedent Relation of the highest Kindness, but the other is only designing extraordinary Kindness for the sake of his Sufferings. Therefore, the Argument for the *Love of God* is taken from what his *Son* was, when he deliver'd him up for us all; he was his *own Son*; not by *Adoption* as others are; S. *John* calls him, his *only begotten Son*; and God himself, *his beloved Son* in the Voice from Heaven; and this before his Sufferings, immediately after his Baptism, when as yet, there was nothing extraordinary done by him, as to the great Design of his coming. Which shews, that there was an Antecedent Relation between him and the Father; and that therein the Love of God and of Christ was manifested, that being the *only begotten Son of the Father*, he should take our Nature upon him and for our sakes do and suffer what he did. This is indeed an Argument great enough to raise our Admiration, to excite our Devotion, to in-

inflame our Affections; but how flat and low doth it appear, when it comes to no more than this, that there was a *Man*, whom, after his Sufferings, *God* raised from the dead and made him a *God by Office*? Doth this carry any such Argument in it for our Esteem and Love and Devotion to him as the other doth upon the most serious Consideration of it?

(2.) Which tends most to beget in us a greater *Hatred of Sin*. For that is so contrary to the Way of our *Salvation* by *Jesus Christ*, that what tends most to our *Hatred* of it, must conduce most to our Happiness, and therefore be *most worthy of all Acceptation*. It is agreed on all hands, that *Christ* did suffer very much both in his Mind and in his Body.

In his Mind, when it is said, *that he was troubled in Spirit*; that *he began to be sorrowfull and very heavy*; and soon after,

Joh. 13. 21.
Matt. 26.
37, 38.

My Soul is exceeding sorrowfull, even unto death. S. Luke saith, *that he was in an Agony*; wherein he not only *prayed more earnestly, but his sweat was as it were great Drops of Blood falling to the Ground*. What made this Amazement,

Mark 14.
33, 34.
Luk. 22. 44

and dreadfull Agony in the mind of the most innocent Person in the World? Was it merely the Fear of the Pains of

Death which he was to undergo? That is impossible, considering the Assurance which he had of so glorious a Reward so soon following after ; when so many Martyrs endured such exquisite Torments for his sake without any such Disturbance or Consternation. But the Apostles give us another Account of it. *S. Peter saith,*
 1Pet. 2. 24. *he was to bear our Sins in his own body on the tree ; that Christ suffered for*
 3. 18. *Sins, the just for the unjust. S. Paul, that*
 2Cor. 5. 21. *God made him to be Sin for us who knew no Sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* Hereby we understand how so innocent a Person came to suffer ; *he stood in our Stead ; he was made Sin for us ;* and therefore was to be treated as a Sinner ; and to suffer that on our Account, which he could not deserve on his own. If he suffer'd on his own Account, this were the way to fill our Minds with perplexity concerning the Justice of Providence with Respect to his dealings with the most innocent and holy Persons in this World ; If he suffer'd on our Account, then we have the Benefit of his Sufferings, and therein we see how displeasing to God sin is, when even his own Son suffer'd so much by taking the guilt of our Sins upon them.

And

And what can tend more to the begetting in us a due hatred of sin, than to consider, what *Christ* himself suffer'd on the Account of it? What can make us have more dreadful thoughts of it, than that the great and merciful God, when he designed to *Save sinners*, yet would have his own Son to become a *Propitiation for the Sins of Mankind*? And unless we allow this, we must put force upon the plainest Expressions of *Scripture*; and make *Christ* to suffer meerly to shew God's Power over a most innocent Person, and his Will and Pleasure to inflict the most severe Punishment without any Respect to *Guilt*. And surely such a Notion of *God*, cannot be *worthy of all Acceptation*.

(3.) Which tends most to strengthen our *Hope of Salvation by Christ Jesus*. If we believe that he suffer'd for our Sins, then we have great Reason to hope for the Forgiveness of them; although they have been many and great, if we sincerely Repent; because the most prevailing Argument for Despair will be removed; which is taken from the *Justice of God*, and his declared *Hatred of Sin* and *Displeasure* against *Sinners*. If God be so much in earnest dis-
pleased

Rom. 5.
10.
2 Cor. 5.
19.
Heb. 9. 15.

pleased with the Sins of Mankind, and his Justice be concerned in the Punishment of Sinners, how can they ever hope to escape, unless there be a way for his Displeasure to be removed, and his Justice to be satisfied? And this the *Scripture* tells us is done by *Christ*, who died that he might be a *Sacrifice of Atonement to Reconcile us to God by his Death*; as *S. Paul* expressly affirms. And by this means, we may have strong Consolation from the Hopes of Forgiveness of our Sins. Whereas, if this be taken away, either Men must believe that *God* was not in earnest displeased with the Sins of Mankind; which must exceedingly lessen our Esteem of the *Holiness* and *Justice of God*; or if he were so displeased, that he laid aside this Displeasure, without any *Atonement* or *Sacrifice of Expiation*. And so, as many as look on *God's Justice* and *Holiness* as necessary and essential Attributes of *God*, will be in danger of sinking into the Depths of Despair, as often as they Reflect seriously on the Guilt of their Sins. But on the other side, if we believe that while we were *Enemies*, we were reconciled to *God by the death of his Son*; then we may have Peace with
God

God through our Lord Jesus Christ ; and have Reason to believe that there will be no Condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus by a lively Faith and sincere Repentance ; then they may with Comfort look up to God as a Reconciled Father, through Jesus Christ our Mediator ; then they may with inward Satisfaction look beyond the Grave, and stedfastly hope for that Salvation which Christ purchased on Earth and will at last bestow on all such as Love and Obey him. To which God of his Infinite Mercy bring us all through Jesus Christ. For, This is a faithful Saying and worthy of all Acceptation, that he came into the World to save Sinners.

F I N I S.



*Books published by the Right Reverend Father in God
Edw. L. Bishop of Worcester, and sold by H. Mortlock at the Phoenix in St. Paul's Church-Yard.*

A Rational account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion ; being a Vindication of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury's Relation of a Conference, &c. from the pretended Answer of T. G. 2d. Edit. *Bl.*

Origines Britannica, or the Antiquities of the British Churches, with a Preface concerning some pretended Antiquities relating to Britain, in Vindication of the Bishop of St. Asaph. *Folio.*

Irenicum, A Weapon-Salve for the Churches Wounds. *Quarto.*

Origines

Origines Sacrae, Or a Rational Account of the Grounds of Christian Faith, as to the Truth and Divine Authority of the Script. and the matters therein contained. 4to.

A Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of *Rome*, and the hazard of Salvation in the Communion of it. *Octavo*.

An Answer to several late Treatises occasioned by a Book entituled, A Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of *Rome*, and the hazard of Salvation in the Communion of it; Part I. *Octavo*.

A Second Discourse in Vindication of the Protestant Grounds of Faith, against the pretence of Infallibility in the *Roman* Church, in Answer to the Guide in Controversie, by R. H. Protestantism without Principles, and Reason, and Religion; or the certain Rule of Faith, by E. W. with a particular enquiry into the Miracles of the *Roman* Church. *Octavo*.

An Answer to Mr. *Cressy's* Epistle apologetical to a Person of Honour, touching his Vindication of Dr. *Stillingfleet*. *Octavo*.

A Defence of the Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of *Rome*, in answer to a Book entituled *Catholics no Idolaters*: *Octavo*.

Several Conferences between a *Romish* Priest, a Fanatick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of *England*; being a full Answer to the late Dialogues of T. G. *Octavo*.

A Discourse concerning Bonds of Resignation of Benefices in Point of Law and Conscience, in *Octavo*.

A Discourse concerning the Illegality of the Ecclesiastical Commission, in Answer to the Vindication and Defence of it: wherein the true notion of the Legal Supremacy is cleared; and an Account is given of the Nature, Original and Mischief of the Dispensing Power.

The Council of *Trent* Examined and Disproved by Catholick Tradition, in the main Points in Controversie between Us and the Church of *Rome*; with a particular Account of the Times and Occasions of Introducing them.

The Unreasonableness of Separation, or an Impartial account of the History, Nature and Pleas of the present Separation from the Communion of the Ch. of *Engl.* 4to.

The Grand Question concerning the Bishops Right to vote in Parliament in Cases Capital stated and argued, from the Parliament-Rolls and the History of former times; with an Enquiry into their Peerage, and the Three Estates in Parliament. *Octavo*.

